

that temperate vespertilionids should have larger litters because they have a protracted period in which to produce offspring, whereas smaller litters are facilitated in tropical phyllostomids by more constant availability of resources. Moreover, phylogenetic as well as mechanical constraints likely maintain the single embryo condition in phyllostomid species. This is supported by the observation that phyllostomid fetuses attain relatively larger size than members from most other families of bats, and multiple embryos likely would cause overly great mechanical and physiological strain on the mother (WIMSATT and TRAPIDO 1952). Finally, TADDEI (1976) suggested that mechanisms operating during ovulation limited the number of ova released from follicles of females of this species. He found that more than one oocyte per ovarian follicle (suggestive of the potential for twinning) was not uncommon yet none of the individuals examined contained more than a single embryo. These observations combine to suggest that twinning is a rare phenomenon that results from accidents during

ovulation or development. Moreover, twinning in the Phyllostomidae likely is a condition that is selected against because of its deleterious effects on the mother. Finally, of the group of Phyllostomid species that exhibit twinning, no phylogenetic or ecological pattern exists regarding which species should exhibit this condition. This suggests that the phenomenon of twinning, although rare, should be expected from any large collection of phyllostomid bats.

Acknowledgements

L. GIMENEZ and H. STEVENS provided field and laboratory assistance. Research assistantships were provided by M. WILLIG and Texas Tech University. I. GAMMARA DE FOX and the National Museum of Natural History of Paraguay provided logistical assistance. PAUL MUELLER and YAGUARETE FORESTS allowed field work to be conducted on their property. CELIA LOPEZ-GONZALEZ reviewed a previous version of this manuscript. I am indebted to each of these people and institutions for their contributions.

References

- BAKER, R. J.; JONES, JR, J. K.; CARTER, D. C. (1976): Biology of Bats of the New World Family Phyllostomatidae. Part I. Lubbock: Texas Tech Univ. Press.
- BAKER, R. J.; JONES, JR, J. K.; CARTER, D. C. (1977): Biology of Bats of the New World Family Phyllostomatidae. Part II. Lubbock: Texas Tech Univ. Press.
- BAKER, R. J.; JONES, JR, J. K.; CARTER, D. C. (1979): Biology of Bats of the New World Family Phyllostomatidae. Part III. Lubbock: Texas Tech Univ. Press.
- BARLOW, J. C.; TAMSITT, J. R. (1968): Twinning in American leaf-nosed bats (Chiroptera: Phyllostomatidae). Can. J. Zool. **46**, 290–292.
- BRADSHAW, G. V. R. (1961): Le cycle de reproduction de *Macrotus californicus* (Chiroptera: Phyllostomatidae). Mammalia **25**, 117–119.
- COCKRUM, E. L. (1955): Reproduction in North American bats. Trans. Kansas Acad. Sci. **58**, 487–511.
- HAMILTON, R.; STALLING, D. T. (1972): *Lasiurus borealis* with five young. J. Mammalogy **53**, 190.
- KOOPMAN, K. F. (1993): Order Chiroptera. In: Mammal Species of the World: A Taxonomic and Geographic Reference. Ed. by D. WILSON and D. REEDER. Washington: Smithsonian Inst. Press. Pp. 131–241.
- TAMSITT, J. R. (1966): Altitudinal distribution, ecology, and general life history of bats in the Andes of Colombia. Amer. Phil. Soc. Yearbook. Pp. 372–373.
- TAMSITT, J. R.; VALDIVIESO, D. (1963): Reproductive cycles of the big fruit-eating bat, *Artibeus lituratus* Olfers. Nature **198**, 104.
- THOMAS, M. E. (1972): Preliminary study of the annual breeding patterns and population fluctuations of bats in three ecologically distinct habitats in Southwestern Colombia. Diss. Tulane Univ., New Orleans.
- WILLIG, M. R. (1985): Reproductive patterns of bats from Caatingas and Cerrado biomes in

Northeast Brazil. *J. Mammalogy* **66**, 668–681.

WILSON, D. E. (1979): Reproductive patterns. In: *Biology of Bats of the New World Family Phyllostomatidae. Part III*. Ed. by R. BAKER, J. K. JONES, Jr., and D. CARTER. Lubbock: Texas Tech Univ. Press. Pp. 317–378.

Wimsatt, W. A.; Trapido, H. (1952): Reproduction and the female reproductive cycle in the tropical America vampire, *Desmodus rotundus murinus*. *Amer. J. Anat.* **91**, 415–445.

Authors adress:

RICHARD D. STEVENS, Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, 79409-3131, USA (e-mail: cmrds@ttacs.ttu.edu)



Short communication

Questionable status of the “Taynguyen civet”, *Viverra tainguensis* Sokolov, Rozhnov and Pham Trong Anh, 1997 (Mammalia: Carnivora: Viverridae)

By J. WALSTON and GÉRALDINE VERON

Wildlife Conservation Society, Cambodia Program, Phnom Penh, Cambodia and Laboratoire
Mammifères et Oiseaux, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France

Receipt of Ms. 04. 12. 2000

Acceptance of Ms. 12. 01. 2001

Key words: *Viverra tainguensis*, Vietnam, systematics, morphology

CORBET and HILL (1992) recognized four species of *Viverra* Linnaeus in the Indomalayan Region. Two of these are known from Vietnam: the large Indian civet, *V. zibetha*, and the large-spotted civet, *V. megaspila* (OSGOOD 1932; DANG HUY HUYNH et al. 1994). In 1997, SOKOLOV et al. described the “Taynguyen civet”, *Viverra tainguensis*, from Vietnam. The description was based on characters of the holotype only, a subadult male. A paratype was designated but its characters were not used in the description. The authors state that they had examined 46 *V. zibetha* from Vietnam, four *V. zibetha* from China, two *V. megaspila* from Vietnam, and eight *V. tangalunga* from Indonesia and the Philippines. In 1999, ROZHNOV and PHAM TRONG ANH assigned an additional five specimens to *V. tainguensis* and later contributed to another publication detailing additional morphometric parameters of two of the specimens (SOKOLOV et al. 1999). Although the present authors have not examined the holotype, which remains at the Zoological Museum of the Moscow State University (ZMMU), the original description of *V. tainguensis* and both subsequent publications contain a number of factual errors and questionable interpretations that cast doubt on the validity of the supposed

new species. However, since V. E. SOKOLOV died in early 1998, it is not clear to what extent he was involved in the latter publication authored by SOKOLOV et al. (1999).

POCOCK (1939) recognised, as full genera, *Viverra*, *Viverricula* and *Moschothera*. *Viverra megaspila* and *V. civettina* were placed in *Moschothera*, which was distinguished from *Viverra*, in the sense of POCOCK, by the absence of sheaths of skin covering the claws of the 3rd and 4th digits of the forefeet. This feature was clearly described and well-figured by POCOCK. CORBET and HILL (1992) placed *Moschothera* as a synonym of *Viverra*, but regarded the claw sheathing as an important diagnostic character for distinguishing *V. zibetha* and *V. tangalunga* from their congeners. Although the claw sheathing is present in *V. tangalunga*, this species is restricted to the Sundaic subregion and is not known from the Indochinese subregion.

In CORBET and HILL's (1992) table 138, the presence or absence of sheathing in each species of *Viverra* is indicated by a “+” or “o”, respectively, for all species except for *V. tangalunga*. However, as confirmed by CORBET (pers. comm.), a typographical error has resulted in the symbols being reversed. The absence of supporting text or

illustrations prevents this error from being easily detected. The remainder of the table agrees with Pocock's (1939) findings.

The most consequential error in the description of *V. tainguensis* by SOKOLOV et al. (1997) relates to the confusion over the sheathing of the front claws. Repeating the error of CORBET and HILL (1992), SOKOLOV et al. (1997) affirmed the presence of sheathing in *V. megaspila*, and its absence in *V. zibetha*, exactly the reverse of the situation found in nature. This error is made repeatedly: the incorrect, reversed, character are said to have been observed in specimens examined; and they are used as the first and most important diagnostic features distinguishing their *V. tainguensis* from *V. zibetha*. In order to check the status of the sheathing on *V. zibetha*, specimens from the Natural History Museum, London (BMNH), were examined. In addition, the 28 specimens at the Institute of Ecology and Biological Resources (IEBR), Hanoi, said to have been examined by SOKOLOV et al. (1997), in the course of their description of *V. tainguensis*, were re-examined (R. J. TIMMINS, pers. comm.). All specimens conformed to the situation as described by Pocock (1939), rather than that as given by SOKOLOV et al. (1997), with respect to the sheathing. Perhaps the characters as given in table 138 by CORBET and HILL (1992) were simply accepted by SOKOLOV et al. (1997), earlier publications were not read carefully, and actual characters of specimens of *V. zibetha* were not ascertained but were merely assumed to be as given by CORBET and HILL (1992). In any event, if the animals ascribed to *V. tainguensis* have sheathed claws, then this trait would be shared between them and specimens properly identified as *V. zibetha*, rather than being one to suggest a specific distinction between the two.

The second supposedly distinguishing feature given by SOKOLOV et al. (1997) for *V. tainguensis* was body size, which was said to be less than that in *V. zibetha*. However, the holotype of *V. tainguensis* is subadult with a head-body length of 600 mm (Soko-

lov et al. 1997) and head-body lengths (of 790 and 780 mm) have been provided for only two additional specimens, both adults (ROZHN OV and PHAM TRONG ANH 1999). These measurements are well within the known range of 740–860 mm for *V. zibetha* (CORBET and HILL 1992). Although Pocock (1939) was cited by SOKOLOV et al. (1997), they made no mention of adult specimens of *V. zibetha* that Pocock examined from northeastern India, Nepal, and Myanmar, and which had head-body lengths of 742–863 mm. In addition, THOMAS (1927) described a subspecies of *V. zibetha* (*V. z. surdaster*) from northern Laos and central and southern-central Vietnam; the last locality being less than 50 km from the type locality of *V. tainguensis*. SOKOLOV et al. (1997) and ROZHN OV and PHAM TRONG ANH (1999) did not mention THOMAS's *V. z. surdaster*, although it was listed by CORBET and HILL (1992). THOMAS (1927) described *V. z. surdaster* as "averaging rather smaller than true Indian *zibetha*", and noted further that "among the variable races of the... Indian, civet the form may be distinguished by its comparatively small size and especially by its small bullae". The condylobasal length of the only existing adult skull of *V. tainguensis* is 132.5 mm (SOKOLOV et al. 1999), whilst that of the type of *V. z. surdaster* measures 128 mm, and specimens measured by Pocock (1939) range from 129–135 mm for *V. z. pruinosa*. The specimens that THOMAS assigned to *V. z. surdaster* are clearly important in assessing the validity of *V. tainguensis* and it appears that *tainguensis* cannot be distinguished from *surdaster* based on measurements. Certainly the body and skull sizes given for *V. tainguensis* fall within the range of those known for *V. zibetha*, and in no way argue for the specific distinctness of the former.

The supposed third distinguishing feature of *V. tainguensis* given by SOKOLOV et al. (1997) was relative tail length. The tails of the seven specimens of *V. tainguensis*, were reported to average 52% of the head-body length, proportionately smaller than the 55–60% given for *V. zibetha*. However, the mean tail to head-body length of the adult